UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,729	10/16/2003	Alvin Y. Kobashikawa	PGEN-P2	4625
²⁶⁷⁹³ LEIGHTON K	7590 04/04/2007 CHONG		EXAMINER	
PATENT ATTORNEY			GILBERT, SAMUEL G	SAMUEL G
133 KAAI STREET HONOLULU, HI 96821			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3735	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE '	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/28/2004; 1/16/2004.

6) Other: _

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 3735

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too long. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements filed 1/16/2004 and 5/28/2004 have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Page 3

Claims 2-6 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 - "and/or" in line 3 is indefinite.

Claim 11 - "and/or" in line 3 is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee(5,676,637).

Claim 1 - element -1- is a base, element -35- is motor, element -6- is a power source. Elements -32- are screw shafts, elements -33- and -2- are included in the upper portion. The screw shafts extend into element -33- in inner threaded holes, column 4 lines 5-10. Element -33- is considered a screw-thread traveler.

Art Unit: 3735

Claim 2 - control of the length of extension of the reciprocating element -2- is set forth in column 7 lines 24-33. The examiner's is considering these controls electronic.

Claim 8 - element -2-has a rounded outer shape formed integrally with the traveler and driven in a reciprocating motion. Integral need not be a one-piece article. In re Kohno (CCPA) 157 USPQ 275.

Claims 24 and 30 - are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sandvick et al (6,368,268).

Claim 24 - electronic stimulation devices are set forth as elements -15- and -35-, the stimulators are shown as receiving signals only however, the input device my be the stimulator, as set forth in column 3 lines 16. The examiner is considering these input devices to be similar to the devices set forth by Abbassi (2003/0036678). A network connection is shown in figure 1. Cameras -13- and -33- and a microphone (not shown) are used to transmit sound and video. An external service is set forth in column 4 lines 16-20. The external service allows a plurality of users, column 4 line 19.

Claim 30 - chat rooms and video feed sites are taken to be "virtual conference room" and to inherently include posted images.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandvick et al (6,368,268, hereinafter Sandvick)) in view of Bowman-Amuah (6,332,163, hereinafter Bowman).

Sandvick teaches a system as claimed including setting forth a plurality of different types of internet site and administrative functions such as ID and password verification (column 4 lines 63-67). Pay sites inherently billing and payment methods. A specific three tiered website is not set forth. Bowman sets forth a description of tiered architecture column 32 lines 15 through column 34 line 25 pointing out three-tiered or multi-tiered website architecture is well known in the arts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the website format in a three tier format as claimed to gain the advantages as set forth in column 33 line 40 through column 34 line 10.

Claim 26 - the user ID and password would require a registration site which obviously could be on its own tier.

Claim 27- any number of persons may interconnect to form a session column 4 lines 19 and 20 and they may interconnect to live feeds, column 4 line 18 and 19 or prerecorded video feeds, column 4 line 33. See also column 4 lines 46-51.

Claim 28 - the live video feeds include audio and visual from a physical location.

Claim 29 - observers are taught in column 4 line 22.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 9, 10, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3-6 and 11-13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 16-23 are allowed.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent and Patent Publications 6,632,185, 2003/0036678, 6,695,770, 7,104,950, and 6,592,516 teach interactive stimulation systems and devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Gilbert whose telephone number is 571-272-4725. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571-272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/687,729

Art Unit: 3735

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Samuel G. Gilbert Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735 Page 7